

REMARKS

This is in full and timely response to the Office Action mailed on April 18, 2011.

Support for the claims may be found variously throughout the specification. *No new matter has been added.*

Reexamination in light of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claim objections and rejections

While not conceding the propriety of the claim objections and rejections, and in order to advance the prosecution of the present application, the claims objected to and the claims rejected have been canceled.

Newly added claims

i. Claim 64 has claims 65-69 dependent thereon.

Claim 64 is drawn to a timing notice apparatus comprising:

a synchronization information extraction circuit configured to extract frame synchronization information from within a reference signal, a frame frequency for a frame of image data being the frequency for said frame synchronization information;

a synchronization information generation circuit configured to generate synthesized synchronization information in the absence of said reference signal, said frame frequency for the frame of image data being the frequency for said synthesized synchronization information.

Either individually or as a whole, the references cited within the Office Action in the rejection of the prior claims ***fail*** to disclose, teach, or suggest *a synchronization information generation circuit configured to generate synthesized synchronization information in the absence of said reference signal, said frame frequency for the frame of image data being the frequency for said synthesized synchronization information.*

ii. Claim 70 is an independent claim.

Claim 70 is drawn to a computer configured to generate acquisition commands, the computer comprising:

an interface unit configured to await a reception of a timing notice signal after transmitting one of the acquisition commands, a subsequent one of the acquisition commands being transmissible from said interface unit only after said reception of the timing notice signal,

wherein said acquisition commands are generated at a rate of said reception, said rate being at a frame frequency for a frame of image data.

Either individually or as a whole, the references cited within the Office Action in the rejection of the prior claims ***fail*** to disclose, teach, or suggest a computer *wherein said acquisition commands are generated at a rate of said reception, said rate being at a frame frequency for a frame of image data.*

iii. Claim 71 has claim 72 dependent thereon.

Claim 71 is drawn to a computer program embodied in a tangible non-transitory computer-readable storage medium, acquisition commands being generated by the computer program, the computer program comprising:

a device driver configured to transmit one of the acquisition commands and thereafter await a reception of a timing notice signal, a subsequent one of the acquisition commands being transmissible by said device driver only after said reception,

wherein said acquisition commands are generated at a rate of said reception, said rate being at a frame frequency for a frame of image data.

Either individually or as a whole, the references cited within the Office Action in the rejection of the prior claims **fail** to disclose, teach, or suggest a computer program *wherein said acquisition commands are generated at a rate of said reception, said rate being at a frame frequency for a frame of image data.*

iv. Claim 73 has claims 74-85 dependent thereon.

Claim 73 is drawn to an editing system comprising:

a timing notice apparatus configured to output a timing notice signal and receive acquisition command transmissions, said timing notice apparatus outputting said timing notice signal after receiving one of the acquisition command transmissions;

a computer configured to output said acquisition command transmissions and receive said timing notice signal, said computer awaiting a reception of said one of the

timing notice signal after outputting said one of the acquisition command transmissions,

wherein a frequency rate for said timing notice signal is a frame frequency for a frame of image data, output of said acquisition command transmissions from said computer being synchronous with said frequency rate.

Either individually or as a whole, the references cited within the Office Action in the rejection of the prior claims *fail* to disclose, teach, or suggest an editing system *wherein a frequency rate for said timing notice signal is a frame frequency for a frame of image data, output of said acquisition command transmissions from said computer being synchronous with said frequency rate.*

v. Claim 86 has claim 87 dependent thereon.

Claim 86 is drawn to a method for acquiring timing notice signals, the method comprising:

transmitting an acquisition command from a computer, said computer awaiting a reception for one of the timing notice signals after transmitting said acquisition command;

awaiting said acquisition command from said computer, said timing notice apparatus outputting said one of the timing notice signals only after receiving said acquisition command,

wherein a rate of output for said timing notice signals at a frame frequency for a frame of image data, said computer generating said acquisition commands at said rate.

Either individually or as a whole, the references cited within the Office Action in the rejection of the prior claims ***fail*** to disclose, teach, or suggest a method *wherein a rate of output for said timing notice signals at a frame frequency for a frame of image data, said computer generating said acquisition commands at said rate.*

Allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Official Notice

There is no concession as to the veracity of Official Notice, if taken in any Office Action.

An affidavit or document should be provided in support of any Official Notice taken. 37 C.F.R. §1.104(d)(2), M.P.E.P. §2144.03. See also, *Ex parte Natale*, 11 USPQ2d 1222, 1227-1228 (Bd. Pat. App. & Int. 1989)(failure to provide any objective evidence to support the challenged use of Official Notice constitutes clear and reversible error).

Conclusion

This response is believed to be a complete response to the Office Action.

Applicants reserve the right to set forth further arguments supporting the patentability of their claims, including the separate patentability of the dependent claims not explicitly addressed herein, in future papers.

For the foregoing reasons, all the claims now pending in the present application are allowable, and the present application is in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, favorable reexamination and reconsideration of the application in light of the remarks is courteously solicited.

If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions that could place this application in even better form, the Examiner is requested to telephone Brian K. Dutton, Reg. No. 47,255, at 202-955-8753.

Dated: July 15, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Christopher M. Tobin

Registration No.: 40,290

RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC

Correspondence Customer Number: 23353

Attorney for Applicant